

SLAVERY

5.

DEFENDED FROM SCRIPTURE,

AGAINST

THE ATTACKS OF THE ABOLITIONISTS,

IN A SPEECH

DELIVERED BEFORE THE GENERAL CONFERENCE

OF THE

METHODIST PROTESTANT CHURCH,

IN BALTIMORE, 1842.

BY ALEXANDER McCABE.

Baltimore:

PRINTED BY WM. WOODY.
1842.

Sp. Coll

Rare Bk.

E
449

.m. 1.5x

1842

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1842, by ALEX-
ANDER McCABE, in the Clerk's office of the District Court of Maryland.

P R E F A C E .

At the General Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church, held in Baltimore in May, 1842, memorials from different societies were presented to that body, praying for the abolition of slavery in the Church. One of these memorials, brought up by the Rev. T. Hicklin, of Indiana, was extremely offensive in its language, as it called slaveholders "thieves, robbers, pirates," and declared them "to be deserving of a pirate's death."* But notwithstanding its offensive character, it was turned over with the others to the committee on memorials, a majority of whom signed and presented the following report:—

"Your committee, to whom was referred the several memorials upon the subject of slavery as connected with the Methodist Protestant Church in these United States, beg leave respectfully to report:—That they have had under consideration the said memorials, thirteen in number, and bearing upwards of 500 signatures. They have also considered the resolutions of the Ohio, Pittsburg, New York, New Jersey, Indiana, Champlain, Vermont, Genessee, and Onandagua Annual Conferences upon the same subject.

"Your committee, after prayerful and patient deliberation, have come to the conclusion that the time has arrived when some action should be had by this General Conference, whereby the Northern Conferences should be exonerated from all participation in this great moral evil, as your committee conceive it to be,† and we can discover no way in which this can be done, short of some rule being laid down by this body, whereby the 9th item of the elementary principles of our Church shall be more strictly and generally enforced, and the 5th paragraph of Section 4, Article 7, of the Constitution, more clearly understood by all our members.

"While we would deeply sympathise with our brethren who are situated within the bounds of those States and Territories where slavery is legalised, and where to procure other than slave labour is next to impossible—yet we believe this, their unfortunate situation, is one in which God calls them to suffer, rather than to hold their fellow beings in per-

* I very much doubt if Rev. Mr. Hicklin knows what a pirate's death is.

† When the celebrated Joseph Addison, who, though an elegant writer, was a poor speaker, was about to make a speech in the British House of Commons, he addressed the Chair and said: "Mr. Speaker, I conceive"—got no farther, but coughed and sat down. Shortly afterwards he arose again, and said: "Mr. Speaker, I conceive," coughed again, and sat down. Not discouraged by his former failures, he rose the third time, and said again, "Mr. Speaker, I conceive," but coughed again, and sat down. Thus

Thrice he essayed to speak, and thrice sat down.

Upon which a waggish member arose and observed, "Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just taken his seat has '*conceived*' three times, and brought forth nothing." So may I say of these five abolition committee men, they all "*conceived*" and brought forth nothing. No: not as much as "a ridiculous mouse" of an argument.

petual bondage; and your committee *cannot believe** that the Father of our mercies will hold us guiltless, as an ecclesiastical body, should we turn a deaf ear to the prayer of the petitioners, and the resolves of one-half of our Annual Conferences. Therefore, in order that our ministers, preachers, members, and all of our official bodies may more clearly understand their duty, in view of the aforesaid item in the elementary principles, and also the article alluded to in the Constitution, we submit the following resolutions for the action of the Conference:

"1. Resolved, That slavery as it exists in the Methodist Protestant Church in these United States is opposed to the morality of the holy Scriptures, and consequently a great moral evil.

"2. Resolved, That the several Annual Conferences at their next sessions, be instructed to record the sense of their several bodies relative to the distinction made in the 1st and 2d Sections, Article 12, of the Constitution, relative to colour; and should two-thirds of the Annual Conferences decide said distinctions to be unscriptural, or that, in their judgment, the words "white" ought to be removed from the said sections, a convention shall be authorized for the purpose of erasing them. Your committee also recommend the insertion of the following in the general rules on page 76, immediately following the words 'doing to others as we would not they should do unto us,' viz. buying or selling men, women, or children, or holding them in slavery.

E. JACOBS, *Chairman.*"

It was upon this occasion that the following speech, which is now enlarged, was delivered. But being interrupted in it, by a call for adjournment, I was prevented from saying all, at the time, that I intended to say. I was, however, importuned, by some who heard me, to write out my views on the subject and publish them. I have consented—1. Because, I was convinced, from what I saw and heard from the leading abolitionists in Conference, they did not understand the subject themselves. 2. Because it seems to be generally assumed as an incontrovertible point by those in the Church and those in the State, that "slavery is opposed to the morality of the Scriptures," and is positively condemned in the word of God. 3. Because I have never seen any publication that expressly takes up the subject and treats of it on *gospel principles*. Something then is wanted to place the subject in a Scriptural point of light. If the following remarks will accomplish that purpose—if they will afford any information to the abolitionists—if they will disabuse the public mind of the errors under which it has laboured, and continues to labour—if they will relieve the religious community of doubts and fears which they may have entertained on the subject—and if they will tend to strengthen the bond which binds these States together, so that their integrity may be preserved, then will my highest wishes be gratified, and to God's name shall be ascribed all the glory.

ALEXANDER McCAINE.

EDGEFIELD DISTRICT, S. C., }
June 27th, 1842. }

* "I cannot see"—"I cannot imagine"—"I cannot suppose"—"I cannot conceive," and such like phrases, were frequently used by Jacobs, Witsel, Bennett, Hicklin, Stier, and other violent abolition speakers. And will it follow, gentlemen, that because "*you* cannot see," others cannot see? You ought to have made yourselves better acquainted with what your B.bles say on the subject, than what you seem to have done, before you began to lecture Southern men on the evil of slavery. Indeed, you ought to have "tarried in Jericho till your beads were grown "

SPEECH, &c.

MR. PRESIDENT: I rise, sir, to offer some remarks on the subject of slavery: and in doing this, shall be obliged to take a more extensive range than I would have done, had not the memorialists represented slavery as a thing of comparatively recent date, and as being a great *moral evil*. Now, sir, to neither of these propositions can I subscribe. In the report of the committee of the South Carolina Conference, which, very much against my wishes, has been read from their journals before this body, I have said, that "slavery has existed in all ages of the world since the flood, and has been incorporated with all forms of religion, Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian."* If I am correct in this statement, and that I am, I think history will bear me out, it cannot be considered a thing of recent date. Nor, when we consider the origin and institution of slavery, can we consider it a great moral evil. Forty-two years ago, when the subject of slavery was agitated in a General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this city, I said, that slavery is *not a moral evil*; and I have seen, or heard nothing from that time to this, that has caused me to change my opinion.

If we turn, sir, to the oldest book in existence, and of the truth of whose records there can, among Christians, be no doubt, we will find that, at a very early period of time, the institution of slavery was predicted and ordained by God Himself, through his servant Noah. The prophetic denunciation of Noah, of one of the three branches of his family, is the first notice of slavery upon record; and it was uttered at the very dawn of time. He spoke under the impulse and dictation of Heaven. His words were the words of God himself, and by them was slavery ordained. This was an early arrangement of the Almighty, to be perpetuated through all time, and was intended to cement and compact the whole human family—to establish the system of mutual relation and dependency,—and to sustain the great chain of subordination, so essential to the Divine, as well as all human governments. The words of Noah are: "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant."† Gen. ix. 25—27.

Nor, if we consider the character of those who were possessed of slaves, can we pronounce slavery a "*great moral evil*." Abraham is the first, of whom we read, who held slaves, and he had 318 who were born in his house. Gen. xiv. 14. With these he pursued the confederate kings, who had captured his nephew Lot; and with them, rescued Lot, "his goods, the women and the people." He had slaves given him by Pharaoh, when he dwelt in Egypt. Compare Gen. xii. 16, with xvi. 1. By Abimelech, king of Gerar. Gen. xx. 14. And he had slaves "bought with his money." See Gen. xvii. 13 and 27. Now, in what light is the

* "Slavery, at a very early period after the Flood, prevailed, perhaps, in every region of the globe."—*Encyclop. Brita.*

† See a letter, signed J. J. S ——. Baltimore: printed 1841.

character of Abraham represented in the Holy Scriptures? Is he not called "the father of the faithful"—"the friend of God?" How then could these appellations be given him, by the Holy Spirit, if he were a *great sinner*, and lived in the practice of a *great moral evil*? Impossible. Either the standard of morals has been changed, or slavery is not that great moral evil that the abolitionists represent it to be.

Next to Abraham stands Sarah his wife. "Now Sarai, Abram's wife, bare him no children: and she had a handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name was Hagar. Gen. xvi. 1. Dr. Clarke remarks on this passage,—“As Hagar was an Egyptian, St. Chrysostom's conjecture is very probable, that she was one of those female slaves which Pharaoh gave to Abram when he sojourned in Egypt. xii. 16.” “The slave being the absolute property of the mistress, not only her person, but the fruits of her labour, with all her children, were her owner's *property* also. The children, therefore, which were born of the slave, were considered as the children of the mistress. It was on this ground that Sarai gave her slave to Abram.” And again: “Sarai certainly stands at the head of all the women of the Old Testament, on account of her extraordinary privileges. I am quite of Calmet's opinion; that Sarai was a type of the blessed *Virgin*. St. Paul considers her a type of the *New Testament*, and *heavenly Jerusalem*; and as all *true believers* are considered as the children of Abraham, so all faithful, holy women are considered the daughters of Sarah. Gal. iv. 22, 24, 26.” See Dr. Clarke on Gen. xvii. 16. Now, where in the Scriptures will the abolitionists find a *sinner* practising a *great moral evil*, represented as a type of a Divine object? They cannot find one.

The next in order is Isaac. “He had possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and *great store of servants*; and the Philistines envied him.” Gen. xxvi. 14. “He who blessed him in the increase of his *fields*, blessed him also in the increase of his *flocks*; and as he had extensive possessions, so he must have many *hands* to manage such concerns; therefore it is added, *he had great store of servants*—he had many domestics, some born in his house, and others *purchased by his money*.” Dr. Clarke in loc.

Next to Isaac is Jacob. He had Zilpah and Bilhah. the slaves of his wives, given him by their respective mistresses, and for the same purpose that Sarah gave Hagar to Abraham. And it is said of this Patriarch also, that “the man increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maid servants and men servants, and camels and asses.” Gen. xxx. 43.

And the last I shall notice is Job. “His substance also was seven thousand sheep, and three thousand camels, and five hundred yoke of oxen, and five hundred she asses, and a *very great household*; so that this man was the greatest of all the men in the East.” Job i. 3. Of him Calmet says: “Job was a man of great probity, virtue and religion, and he possessed great riches in cattle and *slaves*; which, at that time, were the chief wealth even of princes in Arabia and Edom.”

And is it of this slaveholder that God hath said, “Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil? i. 8. Is it to this slaveholder that God directs his calumniators to go that he may pray for them, declaring at the same time, “him will I accept.” xlii. 7, 8. Is it with Noah and Daniel that this same slave holder is put on a level by God himself. Ezekiel xiv. 14. And even in the New Testament, is the most honorable mention made of this slaveholder, when he is proposed by St. James as a

pattern of patience to all Christians. James v. 10, 11. O, how humiliating to the pride and arrogance of the heart of the abolitionist must it be to be turned over, by God, to the slaveholder, to be prayed for by *him*, with an assurance "*him* will I accept." And what strange inconsistency for the Holy Spirit to propose a character, who, according to the doctrine of the abolitionists, was guilty of a *great moral evil*, under the Old Testament dispensation, as a pattern, worthy of imitation, to Christians, under the New!! Such, however, are some of the absurdities into which the abolition scheme unavoidably conducts its advocates and friends.

Now, these few instances may suffice to show, that some of the most eminent of the Old Testament saints were slaveholders; nor is there the least hint by any of the New Testament writers, that they were guilty of a *great moral evil* in holding their fellow beings in bondage. Where do the abolitionists, then, get their authority for anathematising slaveholders, and fixing on them such opprobrious and unchristian epithets as "thieves," "robbers," "pirates," &c? For this they have no authority, neither from the Old Testament nor the New.

Passing from the consideration of these few individual cases in the Old Testament, it is important to notice what history says on the subject of slavery as connected with the different nations of the earth. "Almost every page of ancient history," says Wallace, in his Dissertation on the Numbers of Mankind, "demonstrates the great multitude of slaves; which gives occasion to a melancholy reflection, that the world, when best peopled, was not a world of freemen, but of slaves."* "And in every age and country, until times comparatively recent," says Hallam, "personal servitude appears to have been the lot of a large, perhaps the greater portion of mankind."†

"Slavery," says Professor Dew, "was established and sanctioned by Divine Authority, among even the elect of Heaven—the favored children of Israel. Abraham, the founder of this interesting nation, and the chosen servant of the Lord, was the owner of *hundreds* of slaves. That magnificent shrine, the Temple of Solomon, was reared by the hands of slaves. Egypt's venerable and enduring piles were reared by similar hands. Slavery existed in Assyria and Babylon. The ten tribes of Israel were carried off in bondage to the former by Shalmanezar, and the two tribes of Judah were subsequently carried in triumph by Nebuchadnezzar, to beautify and adorn the latter. Ancient Phœnicia and Carthage had slaves: the Greeks and Trojans, at the siege of Troy, had slaves. Athens and Sparta, and Thebes, indeed the whole Grecian and Roman worlds had more slaves than freemen. And in those ages which succeeded the extinction of the Roman Empire in the west, '*Servi* or slaves,' says Dr. Robertson, seem to have been the most numerous class."

There is one thing asserted in this quotation, Mr. President, which requires something more than a passing remark, because it has an important bearing upon the principles and practices of the abolitionists. By whom was the Temple of Solomon built? Was it reared by the hands of freemen or of slaves? Mr. Dew says by slaves, and for his assertion the following facts and quotations may serve as proofs:

1. Because, when Solomon ascended the throne, he became possessed of many slaves, which were left him by his father. David was a man of war, conquered several nations, and reduced those whom he spared to a state of slavery. "And when all the kings that were servants to Hadare-

* Quoted by Dew, in his "Review of Slavery."

† Ibid.

zer saw that they were smitten before Israel, they made peace with Israel, and *served them*. II Sam. x. 19. "Thus," observes Dr. Delaney, "the arms of David were blessed; and God accomplished the promises which He had made to Abraham. Gen. xv. 18; and renewed to Joshua. i. 2, 4. And thus, in the space of *nineteen or twenty years*, David had the good fortune to finish gloriously *eight wars*: all righteously undertaken, and all honourably terminated. *viz.*—1. The civil war with *Ishbosheth*. 2 The war against the *Jebusites*. 3. The war against the *Philistines* and their *allies*. 4. The war against the *Philistines alone*. 5. The war against the *Moabites*. 6 The war against *Hadadazer*. 7. The war against the *Idumeans*. 8. The war against the *Ammonites* and *Syrians*. This last victory was soon followed by the complete conquest of the kingdom of the Ammonites, abandoned by their allies." Dr. Clarke in loc.

"And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brick-kiln; and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon." II Sam. xii. 31. On this passage Dr. Clarke remarks: "From this representation a great cry has been raised against David's unparalleled, if not diabolical, cruelty. I believe this interpretation was chiefly taken from the parallel place I. Chron. xx. 3., where it is said, he *cut them with saws*, and with *axes*, &c. Instead of *vaiyaser*, he *saved*, we have here (in Samuel) *vaiyasem*, he *put them*: and these two words differ from each other only in *in a part of a single letter*, *resch* for *mem*. And it is worthy of remark that instead of *vaiyaser* he *saved*, in I Chron. xx. 3, six or seven MSS. collated by Dr. Kennicott, have *vaiyasem*, he *put them*; nor is there found any various reading in all the MSS. yet collated for the text in this chapter, that favours the common reading in Chronicles. The meaning therefore is, He made the people *SLAVES*; and employed them in *sawing*; making *iron harrows*; or *mining*, for the word means both; and in *hewing wood*, and *making brick*." See also Coke's Notes, and Kempton's works, in loc.

2. Because it was adopted as a rule of policy by Solomon, as well as by *Sesostris*, king of Egypt, to make his slaves perform the offices of drudgery and hard labour, instead of imposing these services on the children of Israel. "And Solomon sent to Hiram saying. . . Now therefore command thou that they hew me cedar trees out of Lebanon; and *my servants* shall be with thy servants. . . And Solomon had three score and ten thousand that bare burdens, and four score thousand hewers in the mountains." I Kings, v. 2—15.

3. Because it is expressly said, that of the children of Israel, Solomon made no *bondmen*. "And all the people that were left of the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, which were not of the children of Israel,—their children that were left after them in the land . . . upon those did Solomon levy a tribute of *bond service* unto this day—but of the children of Israel did Solomon make no bondmen, but they were men of war."

Now, sir, having, I think, established the position that Solomon's Temple was erected by the labour of slaves, I would ask, if it is not worth while to contemplate, for a moment or two, the case of an abolitionist, (if there were any of this description of beings in the days of Solomon,) who was required to go up to the house of the Lord, to worship before the most High God in his Temple. You know, sir, that many of the abolitionists of the present day affect to have such tender consciences, and to feel such abhorrence of slavery, that they declare they will not

wear the cotton of the South, because it has been cultivated by slaves. They will not eat our rice, because it has been raised by slaves. Nor will they use our sugar or molasses, because they are the production of slave labour. And yet, these extremely sensitive, and pre-eminently holy characters, feel no qualms of conscience, to sell Southern planters their boots and shoes, their negro cloth, and all the *et cetera* that make up a cargo of *Yankee notions*, and put the money, arising from the labour of slaves, in their pockets. Suppose I say, a modern abolitionist, true to his principles, and consistent with his profession, had been formerly required to go up to worship in the house of the Lord, what would he have done? Methinks I see him turn away with abhorrence, and exclaim with vehemence in some such language as this: "What! shall I? I wont put my foot across the threshold of the building. I shall not defile the purity of my mantle, by allowing it to touch those polluted walls. I shall not participate in the exercises that are performed therein, for the building is stained with blood, and all who go there 'are a brotherhood of thieves, robbers, and pirates, and deserve a death worse than that of a pirate.' No, I am exonerated, and will stand 'exonerated from all participation in this great moral evil.'" And thus, whilst this abolitionist is ranting and raving like a madman, I see "the fire come down from heaven, and consume the burnt offering and the sacrifice; and the glory of the Lord fill the house of the Lord." II Chron. vii. 1.

But I may be told, that all I have said is wide of the mark. That the subject under consideration is, "Slavery as it exists in the Methodist Protestant Church in the United States,"* and not slavery as it existed in the Patriarchal or Jewish Church. Well, be it so: though I do not see that this will help the cause of abolitionism, or strengthen the argument of its advocates and friends. Let us, however, look at the subject a little more minutely.

"The word servant," says Calmet, "generally signifies a *slave*: because formerly among the Hebrews and the neighbouring nations, the greater part of servants were slaves: *they belonged absolutely to their masters*, who had a right to dispose of their persons, their bodies, goods, and even of their lives, in some cases."

"The Hebrews had two sorts of servants or slaves. Lev. xxv. 44, 45, &c. Some were strangers, bought, or taken in war; and their masters kept them, exchanged them, or sold them as their goods. The others were Hebrew slaves, who being poor, sold themselves, or were sold to pay their debts; or were delivered for slaves by their parents, in cases of necessity. This sort of Hebrew slaves continued in slavery, only to the year of Jubilee: when they might return to their liberty, and their masters could not detain them against their wills. If they desired to continue with their masters, they were brought before the judges; here they made a declaration, that for this time they disclaimed the privilege of the law, and had their ears bored with an awl against the door-posts of their master's house, after which they had no longer any power of recovering their liberty." Calmet's Dictionary.—Article, Servant.

"Calmet enumerates six different ways in which a Hebrew might lose his liberty: 1. In extreme *poverty* they might sell their liberty. Lev. xxv. 39. 2. A father might sell his children. See verse 7. 3. Insolvent debtors became the slaves of their creditors. II Kings, iv. 1. 4. A *thief*, if he had not money to pay the fine laid on him by the law, was to be

* I will make no remark upon the unintelligible jargon of this sentence.

sold for his profit whom he had robbed. xxii. 3, 4. 5. A Hebrew was liable to be taken *prisoner* in war, and sold for a slave. 6. A Hebrew slave who had been ransomed from a Gentile by a Hebrew, might be sold by him who ransomed him, to one of his own nation." Clarke on Exodus, xxi. 2.

"Men became slaves among the Romans, by being taken in war, by sale, by way of punishment, or by being born in a state of servitude." Adams' Roman Antiquities, p. 48.

The same writer observes, "Among the Romans, masters had an *absolute power over their slaves*. Juvenal Sat VI. 219. Slaves were not esteemed as persons, but as things, and might be transferred from one owner to another, like any other effects." See the whole chapter on slaves in Adams' Roman Antiquities.

Now, from the above accounts, the condition of the slave among the Jews, as well as among the Romans, was far worse than the condition of the slave in these United States. In the former, the life of the slave was, in certain cases, at the disposal of the master: not so in these United States. Here the master has no power to put his slave to death, for any offence whatever. And even if the master considers him deserving correction, the law prescribes the instrument and extent of the correction. "The slave is here carefully protected in life, limb, and even in a moderate share of liberty, by the policy of the laws; and his nourishment and subsistence are positively enjoined." Dew on Slavery.

But, what is that thing called slavery, which, it is said, "exists in the Methodist Protestant Church in these United States," which has been pronounced by the majority of the committee on memorials, as "opposed to the morality of the Holy Scriptures, and consequently a great moral evil?" Before it was thus denounced, it ought to have been defined. This has not been done: and it is worthy of special notice, that neither the memorials which have been presented—the friends who have brought them up—nor their supporters on the floor of this Conference, have attempted a definition. Nor, in the discussion, has even one argument been offered, nor one single text of Scripture quoted, to prove that slavery is wrong. All is rant. All is declamation. This omission I shall now proceed to supply, but shall first consider the *law* and the *action* itself, which is either right or wrong, as it conforms with, or is contrary to the precept of the law.

And what is *moral law*? Moral law is a rule of moral conduct prescribed by the Supreme Being, *commanding* what is right, and prohibiting what is wrong. And, "an action is rendered *moral* by two circumstances—that it is *voluntary*—and that it has respect to some *rule* which determines it to be good or evil. Moral good and evil," says Locke, "is the conformity or disagreement of our voluntary actions to some law, whereby good or evil is drawn upon us, from the will or power of the law maker." Watson's Institutes, page 9.

And what is slavery? My brother from Virginia has defined it as being "the condition of an individual, whose will is in complete subjection to the will of another." To this definition I will subscribe, as far as it goes: but it does not go far enough for me. I would say—slavery is that condition of a human being, in which, neither his time, his labor, nor the products of his labor, belong to himself, or are at his own disposal. And as time and labor are things of value, I would define slavery, in one word, as that state where the individual is the *property* of another. This, sir, is slavery, whether it exists in the Patriarchal Church, the Jewish Church, or the Chris-

tian Church. Yes, I repeat it, the slave is the *property* of his master, who ever that master may be; and to contemplate him in any other point of light, will make all those parts of the Holy Scriptures which treat of slavery, as a jumble of unmeaning and inapplicable directions, utterly unworthy a wise and holy God. And does not this definition accord with the state of slavery, as it existed in the family of Abraham? He had some slaves who were born in his house. He had some who were given him by Pharaoh king of Egypt, and by Abimelech, king of Gerar. And he had some that he purchased with his own money. In all these, had he not an equal and absolute right? Were they not all his *bona fide* property? They were. And the same may be said of all those slaves, who were owned by masters in the Jewish Church.—Their masters “had a right to dispose of their persons, their bodies, goods,” &c., as we have stated above on the authority of Calmet. Nor can the abolitionists produce one passage from the New Testament, where the case was otherwise in the Church of Christ.

I shall now consider the principal causes or sources of slavery, which I shall class under three heads—conquest, cupidity, and crime; and under each head shall offer an instance or two illustrative of my positions. Conquest, or the laws of war. Although God had promised Canaan to the descendants of Abraham, Gen. xvii. 8, yet, when the children of Israel entered it, under their leader Joshua, they had to war with the several nations which inhabited it. This they did, and were victorious. In the progress of their wars, the Gibeonites heard of their conquests, and fearing for their own lives, they fell upon a stratagem, by which they deceived Joshua and the princes of Israel. They went in disguise, and representing themselves as having come from a far country, imposed on Joshua, “who, without asking counsel at the mouth of the Lord, made peace with them, and made a league with them to *let them live*; and the princes of the congregation swore unto them.” For doing this, “all the congregation murmured against the princes. But all the princes said unto all the congregation, We have sworn unto them by the Lord God of Israel: now therefore we may not touch them. This we will do to them; we will even let them live, lest wrath be upon us, because of the oath which we swore unto them. And the princes said unto them let them live; but let them be hewers of wood and drawers of water unto all the congregation. In other words, they shall be our *slaves*. Joshua ix. On this transaction I shall remark, 1st. The Gibeonites voluntarily agreed to become the *slaves* of the Israelites for ever, rather than be put to death as the other nations of Canaan had been. 2d. They entered into this state of slavery, when the government of the Israelitish nation was a THEOCRACY, and there is no mark of disapprobation, or expression of censure on the part of the Deity, that Joshua or the princes of Israel had done wrong in making the Gibeonites *slaves*. 3d. So far from manifesting any displeasure, the Lord espoused the cause of Joshua, and fought for these *slaves*. “And the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them (their enemies) unto Azekah, and they died: they were more which died with hailstones than they which the children of Israel slew with the sword.” And he even suspended the course of nature at the command of Joshua, that he might have time to be avenged on the Amorites who had made war on those *slaves*. “Sun stand thou still upon Gibeon, and thou moon in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies.” Joshua x.

See the case of those Syrians who assisted Hadadezer, II Sam. x. 19, and also the case of the Ammonites, II Sam. xii. 31.

2. Cupidity, or purchase and sale. The well known case of Joseph will illustrate this head. "And it came to pass when Joseph was come unto his brethren, they stript Joseph out of his coat of many colors, &c.—and cast him into a pit, &c.—And Judah said unto his brethren, what *profit* is it if we slay our brother? come, and let us *sell* him to the Ishmaelites . . . and they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites for *twenty pieces of silver*," Gen. xxxvii. 23—28. On this transaction I shall make two remarks.

1. That it justifies the opinion that a traffic had been carried on in human beings before this time, otherwise it is not likely that Judah would have thought of *selling* his brother; and this opinion is strengthened by the fact, that the caravan of traders expressed no surprise at, or objection to the proposition to *buy*. 2. That this is the first link in the great chain of providential events by which the descendants of Abraham have been distinguished from all the nations of the earth. "God sent me before you, to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance. So now, it was not you that sent me hither, but God." Gen. xlv. 7—8.

The Israelites reduced to a state of slavery in Egypt, may properly be cited also, as falling under the head of cupidity. Their bondage may have had its origin in jealousy and the love of gain. The king of Egypt was jealous of the increasing numbers and growing power of the Israelites; and wished to turn their labor to his own advantage.

3. Crime, or a violation of the laws of civilized society. And under this head will fall the cases of convicts confined in penitentiaries. Instead, therefore, of abolitionists sending up memorials, or coming to this General Conference to obtain an alteration in the book of discipline, to enable them to expel slaveholders from the fellowship of the church, it would be more in accordance with their christian duty to "let their charity begin at home." They tell us, "they deeply sympathise with their brethren who are situated within the bounds of those States and Territories where slavery is legalised," and yet they manifest no concern for those miserable creatures who are incarcerated, for life, in these abodes of wretchedness. If they are concerned for the poor slaves, why not shew some sympathy for the white slaves as well as the negroes? Indeed, sir, I might turn every thing the abolitionists have said against slaveholders, on this floor, against themselves, because of their apathy or indifference to the ease of the poor convicts. Do they tell slaveholders that, "all men are born free and equal, and are entitled to life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness." Not so, in their sense, and to the extent of *their* meaning, or the convicts in penitentiaries are an exception. Do they say to slaveholders, "it is a great *moral evil* to hold men in bondage." Not so, or their practice is at war with their doctrine, for they are tributary to this state of things, by the exercise of the elective franchise. Do they say, to slaveholders, "liberate your slaves." I say in return, liberate your convicts; empty all your penitentiaries, and turn the thousands of burglars, thieves, robbers, and cut-throats loose upon the community. Do the abolitionists say, we cannot do that, for the penitentiary system is established by law. So say I, of slavery. Do they require slaveholders to remove all those "legislators" who have "legalised" slavery, and to elect others in their places, who would abolish the existing laws, and "let the captive go free." This, slaveholders cannot do. And lastly, is it required of slaveholders to take their slaves into free states, and free them there. What free state would admit them? Alas! for the poor negroes. The conduct of the abolitionists has injured them every where, more than language can describe. In

free states, free negroes are a nuisance, as the mobs in Cincinnati, Alton, Philadelphia, New York, &c. abundantly prove. The citizens of free states have either driven them out of their territories, or have been obliged to adopt rigorous measures as a means of their own personal safety. From the inconsistency, therefore, of the abolitionists, I am inclined to think, that their overheated and unjustifiable measures do not proceed from their pure love of liberty, or concern for the poor negro slave, but may be attributed to a principle which they are not willing to admit, as influencing *them*, though it has influenced others. "And the Philistines envied Isaac." Gen. xxvi. 14.

I am now come, Mr. President, to that part of my argument which, I am sure, will secure me the attention of this Conference, because, sir, I have laid down a position which contradicts, point blank, the assertion of the majority of the committee in their report on memorials. For me to have denied that "slavery, as it exists in these United States, is opposed to the morality of the gospel," &c., was, in the opinion of the abolitionists, going too far. But to intimate, as I did, a few days ago, that slavery has always had the sanction of Almighty God, was more than they were able to bear. I saw how they were affected by the declaration. It shocked them to a man. And this blasphemous doctrine, as I believe they considered it,* affected their delicate sensibilities, as much as a shock of electricity would have affected their nerves. I was immediately pronounced an "*Ultra*," and it seemed to be legible in the countenance of every abolitionist, that I had advanced more than I ever would be able to make good. I shall now, sir, though I have no hope of convincing any one of them by what I shall say, and notwithstanding it may procure for me their lasting displeasure, proceed to substantiate what I have laid down in the third head of my argument, namely, "that so far from slavery being opposed to the morality of the Holy Scriptures," it has, and always has had, the sanction of Almighty God.

The numerous cases which I have already brought forward from the Old Testament, will serve as so many irrefragable proofs of the truth of this position.—But as I have much more to offer than what I have already advanced, I shall, for the sake of perspicuity, throw my arguments into the form of a series of propositions.

PROPOSITION I. When God would abolish the relation which subsisted between master and slave in Egypt, he did it by miracles.

To abolish this relation God made choice of his instrument, commissioned him for the purpose, and wrought miracles before his eyes in attes-

* This opinion is strengthened by the following extract of a letter written by the Rev. John Clark, Jr., a member of the General Conference and published in the New York Luminary of June 25, 1842. He says: "Did not the General Conference pass, without official notice or rebuke, the Journal of the South Carolina Annual Conference, exhibiting action by that body on the subject of slavery, which for *blasphemous invasion of divine and human rights*, defies a parallel in the dark and corrupt ages of the Church." Will Mr. Clark allow me to tell him, that the report which was read from the Journals of the South Carolina Conference, and which he says has no "parallel in the dark and corrupt ages of the Church," was written by me. Yes, sir, I wrote it, who was preaching the gospel long before you were born of your mother. It is an easy matter, Mr. Clark, for men in their zeal to write such sentences as that which I have extracted from your letter; but it will not be so easy for you, or them to prove, that what I have said is false—much less blasphemous! What a pretty figure you will cut before an intelligent community, into whose hands this *blasphemous!* pamphlet will fall, for your intelligence, piety, and deep research into the history "of the dark and corrupt ages of the Church."

tation of his divine mission. The Israelites were in bondage in Egypt. They were slaves to Pharaoh; and during their state of slavery, Moses was born, who was subsequently chosen by God to lead them out of "the house of bondage." The first forty years of his life were spent, principally, in Pharaoh's court, where he was instructed under the eye of Pharaoh's daughter, in all the wisdom and learning of the Egyptians. For killing an Egyptian he fled to the land of Midian, and for forty years dwelt in that country, with his father-in-law Jethro, whose flocks he kept. "It was at the end of this long retirement, that God revealed to him his design, to make use of him to deliver his people from the captivity in which they groaned. The Divine Being appeared to him, spoke to him, heard his objections, answered them with condescension, and overcame his repugnance with miracles. Moses convinced of the certainty of his mission, set out for Egypt, and by the way found his brother Aaron, who guided by divine inspiration, had come to meet him."* Thus authorised, he proceeded to discharge his sacred mission, which was twofold. 1st. To go to his brethren and declare the purpose of God concerning them. 2d. To go to Pharaoh, their master, and demand their liberation. Nothing short of miracles,—and miracles too of the most grievous and afflictive character, performed before the eyes of all Israel, would have induced that whole nation to put themselves under the guidance of Moses. And nothing short of miracles oft repeated, could have produced acquiescence on the part of Pharaoh, to let the Israelites go.† When, therefore, the abolitionists would disturb the settled order of Providence, and dissolve the connexion between master and slave, that has been recognised by the great Governor of the Universe, it certainly is not too much for the owners of slaves to enquire, "by what authority doest thou these things, or who gave thee this authority?" And although I admit, that the connexion subsisting between master and slave may, with the consent of those interested, be annulled by legislative enactments, yet until the abolitionists produce some stronger reasons for the dissolution of such connexion, than is to be found in the speeches of L. Garrettson—Abby Kelly—T. Hicklin—F. Stier—and others of the same stamp, it is not saying too much to affirm, that slaveholders will feel themselves under no obligation to comply with their demands.

PROPOSITION II. Slavery has been sanctioned by Almighty God.

In the third month after Moses had safely conducted the children of Israel through the Red Sea, they were encamped before Mount Sinai. From the top of this Mount, God delivered the Ten Commandments, first orally, Exod. xx. 1, next in writing, Exod. xxxi. 8, and thirdly on two tables of stone, to replace those which had been broken by Moses, Exod. xxxiv. 1. The last of these commandments reads thus:—"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his man servant, nor his maid servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbour's." Although this commandment is so perspicuous and plain, yet I shall make a few remarks on it. 1. Slavery is recognised by God: for the *man servant* and *maid servant* are *slaves*. 2. The slave is *property*, as much so as the house, the ox, or the ass. 3. The right of the master to hold such property is allowed and defended. 4. Coveting this species of property is forbidden. 5. There can be nothing *immoral* in holding slaves, since God has sanctioned and defended slavery.

* Anquetil's Universal History, vol. 1, p. 126.

† See Warburton's Divine Legation of Moses.

The prohibitory clause, "thou shalt not covet," is next to be considered. To "covet," according to Walker, "is to desire inordinately, to desire beyond due bounds." When, then, it may be asked, is this commandment violated? It is violated, says Archbishop Secker, in his lectures on the commandments, "first, If our neighbour cannot lawfully part with his property, nor we lawfully receive it. Or, if he can part with it, but is not willing, and we entertain thoughts of acquiring it by force or fraud: or of being revenged on him for his refusal. This is highly blameable, for why should he not be left free master of his own? Indeed, barely pressing and importuning persons, contrary to their interests, or even their inclinations only, is in some degree wrong. For it is one way of extorting things from them, or of giving them trouble, where we have no right to give it.

"But though we keep our desires to ourselves, they may, notwithstanding, be very sinful. And such they are, particularly, if they induce us to envy others. For this turn of mind will prompt us to do them ill, if we can: and, indeed, a great part of the mischief that is done in the world, and some of the worst of it, arises from hence. But were it to produce no mischief to our neighbour, yet it is the directly opposite disposition to that love of him, which is the second great precept of Christ's religion. Nay, indeed, it deserves, in some respects, to be reckoned the worst of ill-natured sins. The revengeful man pleads for himself some injury attempted against him: but the envious person bears unprovoked malice to those who have done him neither wrong nor harm."

"Covet," says Dr. Clarke, on this commandment, "signifies to desire, or long after, in order to enjoy as a *property* the person or thing coveted. He breaks this commandment who, by any means, endeavours to deprive a man of his house or farm—who lusts after his neighbour's wife, and endeavours to ingratiate himself into her affections, and to lessen her husband in her esteem—and who endeavours to possess himself of the *servants, cattle, &c.* of another in any clandestine or unjustifiable manner."

But say the abolitionists, we do not want your slaves—we would not have them if you were to give them to us. Well, then, according to their own declaration, it is not to enrich themselves, or promote their own interest by slave labour, that they have undertaken this crusade against the institutions of the South. This being so, I ask, what then is their object? Is it the freedom of the slave? I think not, for they are decidedly hostile to colonization—they are not for sending one negro out of the country, even if by so doing, he could obtain his liberty. What then can they want? To turn three millions of slaves, with all their ignorance and habits of idleness and vice, loose upon the community? Surely this plan evinces neither *wisdom* nor *goodness*. But if it does, will these same tender-hearted and loving souls take these liberated negroes into their fellowship? Will they receive them into their houses and place them at their tables, or take them, in the holy ordinance of matrimony, as partners, to their beds? This, I think, they will not do. This levelling system, then, is intended exclusively for Southern men. But Southern men have as great a right, on gospel principles, to exact the performance of these things from abolitionists, as abolitionists have from them.

If the abolitionists do not "covet" their neighbour's *property* to appropriate it to their own use—if they do not wish the negro slave emancipated that he may enjoy his liberty in the land of his fathers, more fully than he could possibly do, were he liberated here—And if they are not willing to give proof of their love for the poor blacks, by admitting them

into those States where the doctrine of abolitionism now prevails, that these *dear objects* of their Christian sympathy may enjoy the pleasure and happiness which flow from amalgamation, what object can they have in view, in all those mighty efforts that they have put forth? They have threatened to dissolve the union of these States. They have most awfully disturbed the peace of the Church of Christ, that he has purchased with his own blood. They have laboured to sever the bond which has connected master and slave together. They have endeavoured to excite insurrection, and to spread desolation, servile war, and bloodshed through the land—and for what purpose? They are actuated by *some* motive, and must have *some* object in view. I submit, then, whether the following lines do not express the principle and the object:

“Evil be thou my good. . . .
To do aught good never will be our task
But ever to do ill our sole delight,
As being the contrary to his high will
Whom we resist. If then his providence
Out of our evil seek to bring forth good,
Our labour must be to pervert that end,
And out of good still to find means of evil.”*—MILTON.

PROPOSITION III. The sanction which was given to slavery in the tenth commandment, and the guards that were thrown around that species of property, at that time, have never been cancelled or withdrawn.

From those who would contradict this proposition, I might call for their proof. I might require the abolitionists to cite me the chapter and verse, where the sanction has been expressly annulled. This, I know, they cannot do, for there is no such passage in the Bible.

“He must have optics sharp I ween
Who sees what is not to be seen.”

So far from annulling it, Jehovah legislated for its continuance; and in Exod. xxi., and also in Leviticus xxv. gave sundry directions to regulate the conduct of the owner of slaves; which see. And at the close of the Old Testament, Mal. iv. 4, which verse, the Septuagint, Arabic, and Coptic, says Dr. Clarke, place the last, the Lord hath said, “Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the *Statutes and Judgments*.” And with this verse the Old Testament closes.

PROPOSITION IV. As the Mosaic dispensation was introduced and established by miracles, so also, was the dispensation of the gospel of Christ.

Miracles attended the birth of the Saviour, yet it was not until he entered upon his public ministry, that he found himself under a necessity of working miracles, in proof of his divine commission.* He began preaching the gospel of his Kingdom by requiring his hearers to “*repent*,”—assuring them, that “the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand.” And he promised to those who would yield obedience to him, in virtue of the authority he possessed as Sovereign Lord of all, a recompense infinitely beyond the sacrifices they would make in complying with his requirements.

Here then began that demonstration of THE SPIRIT AND OF POWER, says Bishop Porteus, which was to be the grand basis of his new kingdom

* This quotation was suppressed when the speech was delivered.

—the great evidence of his heavenly mission. The proofs which he gave of his own divine nature, and of his divine mission, were those astonishing miracles which are recorded in Matthew iv. 23. "And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease among the people." And when John the Baptist sent two of his disciples to Jesus to inquire of him, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another? Jesus answered and said unto them, Go, and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them." Matt. xi. 2—5.

"The miracles of our Lord were not merely transient acts, beheld at the moment with astonishment, but forgot as soon as over, and productive of no important consequences. They gave birth to a new religion, to a new mode of worship, to several new and singular institutions, such as the rite of baptism, the sacrament of the Lord's supper, the appropriation of the first day of the week to sacred purposes, and other things of the same nature. Now this religion, and these institutions subsist to this day." Bishop Porteus' Lectures. Lec. V.

We see from this quotation what rites were introduced into the Christian Church, that had no place or existence in the Jewish. Circumcision was laid aside, and Baptism was administered in its stead. The Passover was displaced to give room for the sacrament of the Lord's supper. And the *seventh* day, as a day of rest and worship, gave way to the *first* day of the week, in commemoration of the resurrection of the Saviour of the world. Now, what was there in the Jewish Church that was abrogated by Christ, and was to have no place in that Church, of which he was the founder. St. Paul tells us in Ephes. ii. 15, "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances." On which Dr. Macknight remarks: "The ritual ordinances of Moses, being founded in the pleasure of God, are fitly called ordinances, *dogmata*. But this name cannot be applied with propriety to the precepts of the gospel, *which are all founded in the nature and reason of things*. The ordinances of the law, being designed to keep the Jews separated from the rest of mankind, that they might preserve the oracles of God concerning Christ—designed also, to prefigure the blessings which God was to bestow on all nations through Christ's death, were wisely appointed to continue only till Christ came and died as a sacrifice for sin." Also in Coll. ii. 14, the same Apostle uses this language, "Blotting out the hand writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." On this passage Dr. Clarke observes, "By the handwriting of ordinances, the Apostle most evidently means, the *ceremonial law*." And Whitby says, "*Dogma*, is a rescript or ordinance concerning any thing, a royal or imperial decree. Dan. ii. 13. Hence ritual prescriptions are called *dogmata*. The handwriting of ordinances in the parallel epistle Ephes. ii. 15, is the law of commandments in ritual ordinances or the *ceremonial law*."

These authorities prove, that it was the *ceremonial law*, or the law of Levitical ordinances, and not the *moral law*, or the Decalogue which was abrogated by Christ, and consequently that the tenth commandment, which secures the rights of the owner of slaves, is of the same force and binding obligation in the present day, that it was in the days of Moses.

PROPOSITION V. The sanction given to slavery, in the Old Testament, is renewed and confirmed by the Saviour in the New.

Christ, in his sermon on the Mount, rescued the moral law from those false glosses and interpretations, that were given it by Judaising teachers, and in doing this, he uttered this most important declaration, "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Mat. v. 17, 18. To show that the Saviour meant the moral law, or the ten commandments, I shall quote the language of a few eminent commentators.

"Do not imagine that I am come to violate the Law—*katalusai*, from *kata* and *luo*, I loose, violate or dissolve. I am not come to make the Law of none effect—to *dissolve* the connection which subsists between its several parts, or the obligation men are under to have their lives regulated by its *moral precepts*. But I am come, *plerosai* to complete, to perfect its connection and reference, to accomplish every thing shadowed forth in the Mosaic *ritual*, to fill up its great design: and to give grace to all my followers, *plerosai* to fill up, or complete every *moral duty*.

"It is worthy of observation that the word *gamar*, among the Rabbins, signifies not only to *fulfil*, but to *teach*; and consequently, we may infer that our Lord intimated, that the Law and the Prophets were still to be taught or inculcated by him and his disciples: and this he and they have done in the most pointed manner." Dr. Clarke.

"That the great design of our Lord's appearance might be more fully understood, he proceeded in his discourse and said, *Suppose not that I am come to dissolve* that goodly fabrick of holy precepts contained in the sacred writings of the laws" (the ten commandments) "or the prophets; for I solemnly assure you, that I am not come to dissolve, but rather to vindicate and illustrate, to complete and adorn them both by my example and discourses. *For verily I say unto you*, that as their original is divine, their honours shall be *perpetual*; so that till heaven and earth pass away, and the whole visible frame of nature be disjointed, not one jot or one tittle shall pass or perish from the law, till all things which it requires or foretells shall be effected." Dr. Doddridge.

"Our Lord hath taught us, that all the law and the prophets are comprehended in these two precepts: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,' &c. 'And thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' St. Paul—that he who loves his neighbour as himself hath fulfilled the law, Rom. xiii. 8. And that the whole law is fulfilled, Gal. v. 14, or is perfected, James ii. 8, in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. It is not, therefore, to be thought, that Christ came to dissolve the *moral law*, or any rules of morality" (one of which is the tenth commandment which regards slavery.) Whitby's Annotations.

"When our Lord is explicitly asked by 'one who came unto him and said, Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?' The answer given shows that the moral law, contained in the Decalogue, is so in force under the Christian dispensation, that obedience to it is necessary to final salvation." Watson's Institutes, p. 381.

These authorities are sufficient, I presume, (though many more might be added,) to establish the truth of this proposition beyond the cavils of abolitionists.

PROPOSITION VI. The New Testament contains no prohibition of slavery, nor is there in it one text, in which slavery, or the slaveholder is condemned.

It was surely a hard task that was imposed on the abolitionists in de-

bate, when they were urged repeatedly to produce a single text that condemned the slaveholder. And the shifts and subterfuges to which they were driven, was truly ridiculous. I will here give a sample of their argument. For instance, one said, "Slavery is a creature of law," and on that he descanted *most learnedly*! Another said, "The gospel is for the 19th century," and on that topic, he was *very eloquent*! Another said, "A man may have had slaves left him by his father, and the state in which he resides will not allow him to set them free; in that case, he is not guilty of a *moral evil* in holding them, but the legislature that made the laws was guilty of this evil. The sin is in the system, and not in the man, who is absolutely overruled by the law of the land."* A fourth said, "We have been challenged, Mr. President, to produce one text that condemns slavery—I shall do it, sir—'Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain' "!!! But the cap-sheaf of all was the Rev. Dr. Bennett's set off to the tenth commandment. When I quoted this commandment, this reverend gentleman sneered a smile of contempt; and when he came to reply to me said—"But Mr. Jefferson has said that all men are born free, and are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Well, after this—I shall be surprised at nothing. This gentleman—the Rev. Mr. Hicklin, and the Rev. Mr. Witsell of New York—called us "Thieves," in their respective speeches; but that was nothing compared with Dr. Bennett's rashness—to oppose a statesman to Jehovah, and the Declaration of American Independence to the tenth commandment—was nothing short of blasphemy.

PROPOSITION VII. There is but one standard of morals—and that standard is one and indivisible—it is uniform and perpetual.

It is not popular opinion—it is not the law of the land—but it is the word of God that I receive as the standard of morals. It is this, and this alone, which determines what is a *great moral evil* and what is not. The abolitionists, then, need tell me nothing about what Mr. Wesley said—what Mr. Wilberforce said—what Mr. Jefferson said—or what Mr. Clarkson said. After the great Chillingworth, I say, "the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants." If what they say is not clearly supported by scripture, it passes for nothing with me. In what point of light, then, is the standard of morals represented in the New Testament? The "law" is represented as being "holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good." Could it be otherwise, as emanating from a holy, just and good God? It could not. "This character of the law is perfectly consonant to truth, whether the Apostle is speaking of the law of nature, or the

* Of all the strange and unintelligible things that were advanced in debate, nothing surprised me more than the above statement; because it was uttered by one, who is justly allowed to be one of the most long-headed, clear-sighted, and discerning men in the church. How he came to adopt such a sentiment I know not, unless it was because he was unwilling to admit that slavery is *not* a moral evil. I hope he will allow me to suggest to him a review of his principles, on the following grounds:—Is a "system" accountable? Can sin be in the "aystem," separate from the moral agent? Can a "system" be punished? If so—how—when—where? If in the next world, how can a *non-entity* be damned? If the "system" is not punished—does not sin go unpunished, or the *innocent* slaveholder suffer. If it be the legislature that is to be punished, are they punished in their social, or individual capacity? If in the former, must it not be in this life: if in the latter, may not some escape punishment by getting to Heaven. And if the balance should be damned, wherein will that differ from their being damned as substitutes? My brother, I assure you, I mean no disrespect when I bestow a note on your hypothesis. You are involved in a labyrinth, and do what you will, you will never get clear of your difficulties until you take the Bible as your guide.

law of Moses. By the *commandment*, as distinguished from the *law*, Beza understood the command, "Thou shalt not covet." Macknight in *Loc.*

Dr. Clarke says, "The law, which is to regulate the whole of the *outward conduct*, is holy; and the *commandment*, "Thou shalt not covet, which is to regulate the heart, is not less so."

Where then, I ask again, will the abolitionists find a sentence of condemnation of slavery in the scriptures? If there is nothing there to condemn it, and I am sure there is not, for "where there is no law there is no transgression," how can *they* condemn men for a thing, which is not condemned by the word of God? I am astonished at their temerity. I tremble for the consequences of their rashness. They seem madly bent upon their own destruction, by endeavoring to get men excommunicated from the fellowship of the Church, who hold slaves. But with Mr. Cartwright I will say, "The discipline of Christ's Church, that is necessary for all times, is delivered by Christ and set down in the holy scriptures: therefore the true and lawful discipline must be fetched from thence, and from thence alone, and that which resteth upon any other foundation ought to be esteemed unlawful and counterfeit."* I shall now close this proposition, by a quotation from the good Matthew Henry's work on schism. He says, "let those books be opened which must be opened at the great day. If sinners must be judged by those books shortly, let sin be judged by them now, and let not any man or company of men in the world, assume a power to declare that to be sin, which the sovereign Rector of the world hath not declared to be so, lest in so doing, they be found stepping into the throne of God, who is a jealous God, and will not give this branch of his glory to another."†

PROPOSITION VIII. If slavery be "*a great moral evil*," no slaveholder has enjoyed, or can enjoy, the grace or favor of God as long as he owns slaves: and dying a slaveholder, he is prevented from entering into the kingdom of glory.

Is there any thing unfair in the statement of this proposition? Does not the reprobation of slaveholders necessarily follow, as a legitimate consequence of the doctrine of the abolitionists? But how will this reprobation harmonise with what has been said of Abraham—of Isaac—of Jacob—of Job—and all the other slave owners in the patriarchal and Jewish churches? How can the *exclusive* character of this proposition accord with the acts and doings of God himself, who was pleased to legislate for slavery, and give such numerous directions to his servants, who owned slaves under the Mosaic dispensation? How will it tally with the tenth commandment, which is of the same force and obligation under the gospel, that it possessed under the law? For the Decalogue, like its author, "is the same yesterday, to day, and forever." How can this judging and damning spirit be reconciled to the spirit of the gospel, which teaches humility, righteousness, meekness and love? How can it be reconciled to the precept of the gospel, which says, "Judge not that ye be not judged?" In fine, in every possible view that can be taken of the principles and practices of the abolitionists, they are wrong. They condemn what God has approved. They confound what he has made lucid and plain. They establish a standard for "*moral evil*," which has no existence, only in their own fanatical imaginations. They erect a tribunal of judgment and condemnation, which is not recognised by either the Old Testament or the New. They make the Deity a versatile and

* Quoted by Rev. T. Smyth, in his *Lectures on Apostolical Succession*. Vol. I p. 61.

† *Ibid*, p. 99.

capricious being, having no fixed and permanent rule of right and wrong. They hate, whom God loves. They condemn, whom he approves. And they consign to endless punishment, in the flames of hell, those whom the Saviour has promised to make partakers of his glory in Heaven. Slaveholders, then, may contrast their own spirit and practice, with the spirit and practice of the abolitionists. The one class is quiet and peaceable—the other is contentious and quarrelsome. The one minds their own business—the other obtrusively intermeddles with that which does not belong to them, and for which they cannot be responsible to God. The one produces strife in the church, and threatens to dissolve the Union of the States—the other labors to promote God's glory in the salvation of souls, and to support and perpetuate the integrity of the Union. The conduct of the one has nothing to justify it—that of the other, has. The principles and practices of the one are positively and repeatedly condemned in the gospel—not so, those of the other. The course the abolitionists pursue must lead to their own destruction, whilst there is not one syllable in the gospel that condemns the other.

PROPOSITION IX. If God communicates his grace and spirit to the slaveholder, he holds communion and fellowship with the *sinner*.—If he does not, the slaveholder is a false witness before God.

Here, again, the doctrine of the abolitionists is at war with the doctrine of the Bible. The abolitionists say, slavery is a "great moral evil," and, of consequence, that the slaveholder is a *great sinner*. If this be true, Abraham was a great sinner, and so were all the slaveholders in the Patriarchal and Jewish Churches. And yet, with these very great sinners did a Holy God hold communion, and to them did He impart his grace. A clear proof, that slavery is *not* a moral evil; or, that God held fellowship with those who were sinners; which is repugnant to every idea that we have of God, and contrary to every declaration which is recorded in his word. If, however, they should say, that slavery *was not* a moral evil under the law, but *is* a moral evil under the gospel, I demand proof for the assertion. I require of them to state the basis of the distinction. Do they make the distinction to grow out of the nature and quality of the thing itself? or do they make it by the authority of God's word? It is unphilosophical and absurd to make the distinction from the thing itself, for under both dispensations its nature and essence are the same. And it is unscriptural to say it was right under the law, but it is wrong under the gospel. So that if they strive to avoid one horn of the dilemma, they will fall upon the other—and if they labor to shun Scylla, they will inevitably be shipwrecked upon Charibdis.

Again: Thousands and tens of thousands of slaveholders, have made a profession of the religion of Jesus Christ, at the very time they owned slaves. Now, is their testimony to pass for nothing? It must, or the doctrine that I am combating, must be founded in error. The slaveholder tells us that God has pardoned his sins—converted his soul—and given him his holy spirit to witness, with his spirit, that he is a child of God. Now, this testimony is true, or it is false. If true—it nullifies the favorite doctrine of the abolitionists, and silences for ever their clamors against slaveholders. If false, it must be either an intentional, or unintentional falsehood. If an intentional falsehood, it is a lie—known to be such at the time, and uttered to deceive. If an unintentional falsehood, it is a mistake, growing out of, either the imperfection of the powers of apprehension, or the defect of the testimony. In either case, Religion receives a mortal stab, and the infidel rejoices over the advocates of the cross. "For the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Rev. xix.

If the testimony of the slaveholder can be thus easily set aside, as being hypocritical, the testimony of abolitionists can be set aside also. The slaveholder gives all the proof that the scriptures require, of the reality of the change of his heart, by the holiness of his life and the uprightness of his conversation—the abolitionist, if he does *that much*, can do no more. The secret workings of the heart of each are known only to God, but the overt acts of each become a cognizable affair for the public eye, and for public opinion.

PROPOSITION X. The Holy Spirit recognises slavery in the New Testament, and gives directions for the conduct both of masters and slaves.

To quote all the passages from the New Testament, where the original term *doulos* occurs, which, in our version, is rendered "servant," would be to transcribe a large portion of this part of the word of God. The singular number alone, of this noun, according to Cruden's Concordance, occurs fifty times. And, as it bears different meanings in different places, I shall give those meanings from Parkhurst's Lexicon. *Douleuo*, from *doulos*, servant or slave, means: 1. To serve, in a civil sense, as a servant or slave. 2. To serve, be in subjection, in a political sense, as a conquered nation. 3. To serve, be serviceable to one another, by acts of kindness. 4. To serve, or be in bondage to, in a religious or spiritual sense, as to God, Mammon, sin, the law, idols, legal ceremonies, lusts." "The Greek word *kyrios*, answering to the Hebrew *adon*, to the Latin *dominus*, and to the word *lord* or *master* in English, was not originally given, unless by a servant to his master, by a subject to his sovereign, or in brief, by one bound to obey, to the person entitled to command." "*Kyrios* and *doulos* are corrolates in Greek, just as *master* and *servant* are in English. Indeed, *lord* and *servant* are thus used in the common version of the gospels, but not so properly." Campbell on the Gospels, vol. 1, p. 403.

Now, it is very evident, that the primary meaning of the original word is *slave*; and as it occurs so frequently, I shall only transcribe a few passages, where the term bears that meaning, in proof of my proposition.

"Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey?" Rom. vi. 16. "The word *doulos*, which we translate *servant*, properly signifies *slave*: and a slave among the Greeks and Romans was considered as his *master's property*; and he might dispose of him as he pleased." Dr. Clarke.

"Art thou called being a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." 1 Cor. vii. 21. "Art thou converted to Christ while thou art a *slave*? the *property* of another person, and bought with his money, care not for it." Dr. Clarke.

"Art thou, for instance, called into the church of Christ, (being) in a low rank, not only of an hired servant, but a *slave*? Do not so much regard it, as upon that account, to make thy life uneasy: but if thou canst, without any sinful method of obtaining it, be made free, choose it rather; as what is, no doubt in itself, eligible, yet not absolutely necessary to the happiness of a good man." Dr. Doddridge.

"Servants be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in the singleness of your heart as unto Christ." Ephes. vi. 5.

"As the gospel does not cancel the civil rights of mankind, I say to bond-servants (slaves) obey your masters, who have the property of your body, with fear and trembling, as liable to be punished by them for disobedience: obey also from the integrity of your own disposition as obeying Christ." Macknight.

"Servants obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God." Coll. iii. 2.

"Though the word *doulos* properly signifies a slave, yet in translations of the Scriptures designed for countries where slavery is abolished, the word *doulos* may with truth be translated a servant.—In this and the parallel passage, Ephes. vi. 5, the apostle is very particular in his precepts to slaves and lords, because in all countries where slavery was established, many of the slaves were exceedingly addicted to fraud, lying, and stealing, and many of the masters were tyrannical and cruel to their slaves. Perhaps, also, he was thus particular in his precepts to slaves, because the Jews held perpetual slavery to be unlawful, and because the Judaizing teachers propagated that doctrine in the Church. But from the apostle's precepts it may be inferred, that if slaves are justly acquired, they may be lawfully retained; as the gospel does not make void any of the political rights of mankind." Macknight.

"Let as many servants as are under the yoke, count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." I Tim. vi. 1.

"The word *douloi* here means slaves converted to the Christian faith, and the *yoke* is the state of slavery. . . . Civil rights are never abolished by any communications from God's Spirit. The civil state in which a man was before his conversion, is not altered by that conversion: nor does the grace of God absolve him from any claims, which either the state or his neighbour may have on him. All these outward things continue unaltered." Dr. Clarke.

"Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them well in all things; not answering again." Titus ii. 9.

"The apostle refers to those who were *slaves*, and the *property* of their masters: even these are exhorted to be obedient to their own despots." Clarke. "*Despotes*, a sovereign lord, a sovereign." Parkhurst.

The last I shall notice is the case of Onesimus. Philemon, his master, was a member of the Church at Colosse: "Some think he was a *bishop*, others an elder or deacon." The apostle calls him his fellow-labourer in the first verse. From him, his slave Onesimus ran away, and came to Rome, where he was converted to the faith by the preaching of the apostle. St. Paul was no abolitionist. He acknowledged the *right* of Christians to hold slaves. Accordingly he sent Onesimus, the runaway slave, back to his owner Philemon, and gave him this letter to his master, in which he engages to pay all the loss that the master sustained by the running away of the slave. 18, 19 v. Never was there a fairer opportunity, for the apostle to show his abhorrence of slavery, if he considered it a "*great moral evil*," than presented itself in the case of Onesimus. But instead of doing this, he becomes a party to the transaction,—sends back the slave to his owner, and promises to pay the injury sustained, whatever that might be. Nor is this all: "It may be thought," says Dr. Clarke, in his preface to the epistle to Philemon, "strange that a short letter, written entirely on a *private subject*, without reference to the proof or defence of any *doctrine* of the gospel, should, by the general consent of the Church of God, from the highest Christian antiquity, have been received into the sacred canon; not only as a genuine production of St. Paul, but as a *piece designed by the Holy Spirit for the edification of the Church*. However, such is the fact: and we may add, that this very piece was held so sacred, that even the ancient heretics did not attempt

to impugn its authority, or corrupt its matter, while making dangerously free with the four gospels, and all the other epistles."

PROPOSITION XI. The canon of Scripture is closed: and until the recognitions and precepts of it are abrogated or destroyed by miracles, they remain unchanged in all their force and obligation.

It must be obvious to every one who has attended to what I have already advanced, that I lay great stress on the subject of miracles. And why? Because, the Divine Being when he would either disturb or annul the existing relations between master and slave as established by Providence in Egypt—introduce a new religion—or rescind any part of one existing at the time, did it by miracles. Without these, how could those, for whose benefit this change, or this new religion was intended, know it to be divine? And how could compliance with the demands of the messenger be expected from the multitude, if they did not see some signs from heaven corroborative of his claims? It is upon this principle that every imposter, that ever appeared in the world, has proceeded. Upon this principle every new sect has been formed, that has introduced a new religion—and it is by giving credit to the pretensions of these fanatics and impostors—from the days of Simon Magus, down to those of Joe Smith the Mormon prophet, that the credulous and ignorant multitude have been induced to leave the plain and simple religion of the Bible, which conducts to happiness and peace, and to pursue in devious meanderings those paths, that lead to disappointment, wretchedness and woe. As this principle is one of common sense, founded in the nature and fitness of things, it seems strange to me, that the abolitionists did not perceive the propriety of their laying claim to some supernatural or divine power, to enable them to induce or compel the slaveholders to let their negroes go. To this they have made no pretensions, as far as I know; but have come up to this Conference with a few memorials signed by a few men and women, perhaps by boys and girls—without one argument advanced, or one text of Scripture quoted, to prove that slavery is wrong. And now, as if Divinely commissioned for the purpose, they say to all the slaveholders in the Church, you must emancipate your negroes, or you must be expelled!!! Before they proceed to execute this threat, let me ask them, if they have duly considered a passage at the close of the New Testament. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Rev. xxii. 18, 19. This passage, it appears to me, not only recognises all the doctrines and precepts previously recorded in the New Testament, but it also guards and defends all the rights and privileges of Church members. To add to, or subtract from the one, cannot be done with impunity:—and to cut off from the fellowship of the saints, or expel the other from Church membership, on unscriptural grounds, brings down the wrath of God on the head of the transgressor. I say, then, to the abolitionists, BEWARE.

I have now, Mr. President, gone through that part of my argument which is founded on the Holy Scriptures: and before I sit down, shall beg leave to offer a few farther remarks with reference to the abolitionists themselves—the slave—the Church—and the country. The abolitionists themselves.—I distinguish, sir, between abolitionists in this Conference; some are moderate men—some are violent. I beg, then, that

the former may not apply to themselves what is intended for the latter. Three of the latter class—Bennett, Witsel and Hicklin (I am inclined to think Mr. Jacobs also) called us "THIEVES" in their respective speeches. Now, I need not ask, is that the language of the Christian? It is not. Is it the language of the gentleman? It is not. Is it the language of common decency? It is not. These men, therefore, who profess to be ministers of the gospel, ought to study to give a stronger proof of their alleged divine call, than what is furnished by calling slaveholders "thieves." Indeed they ought to know, that if they were to address this language to a non-professor, personally, they might receive in return a *knock down*.

But they will tell us it is *true*. How? Do they mean to say, that every slaveholder is personally guilty of *theft*, in the common acceptance of that term? This is not only false, but it is absurd. They will tell us, perhaps, that that is not their meaning, but that the ancestors of slaveholders stole them, and that their descendants are involved in the crime. Very well; this being their meaning, we will see if *they* are guiltless. In a small pamphlet written, I am told, by a gentleman of the Baltimore bar, he speaks thus: "And here let us look a little more closely at the connection of our Eastern and Northern friends with Southern slavery, and endeavour to ascertain, what is their exact position in regard to the *great evil* they complain of so bitterly. The Constitution limited the period for the introduction of slaves into this country to the year 1808. In the convention which formed the Constitution, the delegates from Virginia insisted upon its immediate discontinuance, deeming it a political evil: but the representatives from the East and North would not listen to it, on the ground, that their constituents were extensively engaged in the slave trade, and must have a reasonable time for winding up so large a business. Indeed, when a committee of the Convention had reported in favour of limiting the time to the year 1800, and an amendment was moved to extend it to 1808, Virginia voted against it, and the amendment was carried by the votes of Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire. See the Madison papers."

"A very large portion of all the property, in several of the New England States, was earned in the slave trade. It has been estimated, for example, that if every acre of land in Rhode Island were worth a hundred dollars, the aggregate has been twice over earned by the extensive and long continued operations of her citizens in the slave trade. The towns of New Port, Bristol, and Providence, in Rhode Island—Stonington, New London, and New Haven, in Connecticut—Fall River, Boston, and Salem, in Massachusetts, were engaged, to a greater or less extent, for a number of years, in the slave trade; and some of them, like Liverpool, (in England) were almost solely built up by it; and a large portion of the town of New Port, called Factory Point, now in a state of ruin, was devoted for many years to this trade—and few other vessels but the largest Guineamen swam at its wharves." pp. 12, 13.

In the "Southern Quarterly Review," for April, 1842, we are told, page 460, "The last prayer Virginia ever made to mortal man, was in 1773, to King George III. to abolish the slave trade, at least as far as Virginia was concerned. Several of the other colonies sent up to the throne similar petitions; but Great Britain refused to abolish the traffick."

"South Carolina, a British colony, passed an act in 1760, to prohibit further importations; but Great Britain rejected this act with indignation, and declared that the slave trade was *beneficial* and *necessary* to the mother country." Dew on Slavery, quoted from Barham's Observations on the abolition of Negro Slavery.

See also the 9th section of "Walsh's United States and Great Britain," where this subject is discussed at great length, and with great ability.

From these extracts it is clear, that if any were "thieves," they were the citizens of the Northern and Eastern States, who were engaged in the slave trade,—whose descendants are now bellowing out against the descendants of Southern men, who opposed it, "Thieves,—robbers—pirates."

But there is another view I must take of the subject, and truly it is a painful one. These violent abolitionists have all along pressed this Conference to adopt the first resolution in the report of the Committee on Memorials, which reads thus: "Resolved, That slavery, as it exists in the Methodist Protestant Church in these United States, is opposed to the morality of the Holy Scriptures, and consequently a great moral evil." Now, sir, if the Conference were to declare, by a solemn vote, that slavery is a "great moral evil," would that satisfy these gentlemen? I think not. The next thing would be, to have that vote published in every abolition paper in the United States, with congratulations to the friends of abolition everywhere, and with shouts of holy triumph. Well, would that satisfy them? No. The next thing would be, to turn every slaveholder out of the Church, for they would "have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." Well, would they be satisfied with that? No: They would be for sending emissaries to the South, with inflammatory publications and pictorial representations, to excite an insurrection among our negroes: and if they could put arms into their hands, I have no doubt they would do it. This opinion, I am sorry to be obliged to entertain, but I have no reason to think otherwise, from what I see and hear on this floor, or from the recollection of what abolitionists did formerly.

Some twenty years ago, Mr. Samuel G. Griffith, my wife's brother, had a plantation in Harford county, State of Maryland. A negro fellow belonging to him ran away—crossed the Susquehanna, and made his way to Chester, in Pennsylvania. Here he was taken by the hand by abolitionists. They gave him work—gave him a house—and put fire arms into his hands. After some time, his master heard where he was, and taking his overseer with him, went to bring him home. In the evening, when the fellow had returned from his work, his master, accompanied by the overseer, went to his cabin, and finding the door fast, commanded the negro to open it. He refused. The master pushed it open with his foot, upon which the negro fired. The master fell, and never spoke. The negro then turned the gun, and struck the overseer with the butt-end of it, over the head, and killed him too. The negro was put on his trial at the next court, for the murder of his master, and was acquitted. Not a word of blame—It was all right—he was perfectly justifiable according to the doctrine of the abolitionists. He was put on his trial the court afterwards for the murder of the overseer, and was found guilty of manslaughter in the second degree, and was sentenced to be branded with a hot iron in the ball of the thumb of the left hand!!! Is this practical abolitionism? It is the abolitionism of some, but thank God, not of all.

2. What have been the effects—what are the effects—and what will be the effects of the conduct of the abolitionists upon the poor slave? Tongue cannot tell the thousandth part of the evil that has been done the slaves, by the officious intermeddling of the abolitionists. I cannot go into a detail of all that has fallen under my own notice, in the last fifty years. But arguing from the past to the future, I prophesy no good for them, in all coming time. Some forty years ago, I was a member of

the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which was held in Baltimore, from which addresses were sent out to Charleston, S. Carolina, on the subject of slavery. Scarcely had these addresses arrived, before they were seized by the Intendant, at the head of a body of armed men, and burnt in the street. Severer laws than existed antecedently, were soon enacted, and the Rev. George Dougherty, one of the best men that ever set foot into an American Methodist pulpit, was dragged by an infuriate mob from Cumberland street Church, and was pumped in the street. And has not the Rev. Mr. Graves, from Alabama, told you how difficult it is to obtain access to the poor negro now? Their condition was good—but you have made it bad. And in spite of all the warning that has been, or can be given, the abolitionists persist in shutting up every avenue of approach to the slave.

This would not have been the ease, had they always acted on the principles expressed by the Hon. John Quincy Adams, in one of his speeches in the House of Representatives. He said, "With slavery in the Southern States he would not interfere, because, constitutionally, he could not do so: because he had no right to, and because he was willing that the South should manage their own institutions, in their own way." Let the abolitionists, then, return to these doctrines. Let them act on these principles; and the privileges and condition of the slave will be vastly improved, and peace, as a necessary consequence, in both church and state, will be sure to follow.

3. The church. I need not tell *you*, Mr. President, that I was one of a committee, elected by the convention, to draw up a Constitution and form of Discipline for the church. This committee had an eye to the constitutions and usages of the non-slaveholding States, as well as to the institutions and interests of the South. They reported a Constitution, by which the Annual Conferences of the States respectively, should be permitted to make their own rules and regulations on slavery. The Constitution was adopted, and now some of the abolitionists want to have it altered. For what purpose? Is it that they may have the pleasure of expelling slaveholders from the church? Or, is it that they may exalt the negroes to the condition of legislators? They cannot possibly be so stupid as to think, that the Southern community will receive their doctrines, or be dragooned into their measures, because *they* propose them. As it is, they have every thing that they can reasonably require. If they don't want slaves, there is no power that can compel them to have them. If other's have them, and can't get rid of them, the abolitionists will not be damned for the transgression of others.

But there is one point of light in which this subject has not been considered—it is this. The Constitution of the Church, like the Constitution of the United States, was framed and adopted in the spirit of compromise. There were, in the Convention, slaveholders, and there were men who were opposed to slavery. These all agreed to offer up their respective peculiarities on one common altar, for the glory of God and for the good of his Church. In this spirit of peace, the constitution was adopted, and the church organized. Now, who are they that would disturb this order? Who are they who are so clamorous for a change? Who are they, that wish us to violate our conventional faith, and falsify our vows unto each other, and to the Lord? Men, who had no church existence when the church was organized! Men, who, when they were about to join the Church, knew the regulations on the subject of slavery, as well as they do now. If they did not like the regulations, why did they join? If they were so violently opposed to slavery, they might have staid without, or gone elsewhere. No: that wouldn't do: they must join the

church, and now they want the Constitution altered to please them! If they don't wish to remain under the present Constitution, they may "take up their bed and walk."

4. The country. And what is the object of the abolitionists with reference to the country? We are not left to the uncertainty of conjecture to answer this question. They, themselves, tell us; nor is there any mincing in their statement.—Hear what Mr. Birney, the abolition nominee for the Presidency of the United States, says, in his letter of January 10, 1842, addressed to the committee of the National Convention who nominated him for that high office,—“Let the North say, with an emphasis that cannot be misunderstood, that slavery must be abolished, or the Union be dissolved. It is against this usurper (slavery) we would lead her, panoplied in the principles of '76, *combating to death* for the right, and the true spirit of liberty.”

Such is the language of Mr. Birney, the would-be president of the United States. There was, however, a time when no man would have cherished such a sentiment as the dissolution of the Union; or, if he did entertain it, like the atheistical fool in the scriptures, who denied the existence of God, the thought would have remained buried in his own breast. But that time, it seems, is past. And now, the man who is so foolish or mad, as seriously to entertain that sentiment, and has the hardihood to avow it before the world, is the man of all others who is considered, by the abolitionists, most worthy of the honor, and most capable of filling the Presidential chair. Good Heavens! has it come to this? Is the prospect before us—“To be or not to be”—existence or extermination—life or death? It is, for Birney has said, “slavery *must* be abolished.” Respecting which, it may be proper to inquire, When and How? Does he mean gradually, or at once—at the present, or at some future time? At the present unquestionably, for it is within the term of his Presidential office, that he intends this mighty and glorious achievement shall be effected. And How shall it be done—by purchase, or by force? Not by purchase, or allowing slaveholders an equivalent for their slaves; for abolitionists do not admit that slaveholders have any *right* to own slaves, and, consequently, are not entitled to compensation for their emancipation. But it shall be done by force, for he says “he will lead the North against the South, *combating to death*.” And Phillips, an abolition orator, declared at their late meeting in New York, that, “*at all hazard*,” the existing state of things must be abolished. “The ten mile square,” says he, “is the bridge of Lodi—let that be carried and the battle is won.” The bloody flag is now raised at the mast-head, and floats in every breeze. The orders are issued—“Give no quarters to the slaveholders in the South.” Let not the friends of peace then—the friends of religion—the friends of the country—fold their arms, and dream of moderation or clemency, from a man or a party who can indulge such feelings, and avow such doctrines. Let them remember the fate of Samuel G. Griffith, and the acquittal of his murderer at Chester. The Southampton massacre, under Nat Turner, was on a small scale. That in St. Domingo, on a much larger. But it is intended that the massacre in slave States shall be conducted on a scale that, for grandeur and extent, shall eclipse every thing that ever went before it. In the contemplation of the possibility of such an event, although I have much to say, I am so affected I am unable to proceed. Believing that the destruction of Southern men is intended, and will be effected by the abolitionists if they can, I shall close with a passage of scripture, “And they had a king over them which is the Angel of the bottomless pit, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name *Apollyon*.” Rev. ix. 11.